

## R E M A R K S

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §102 and 35 USC §103. The rejections are fully traversed below. The claims have been amended to correct minor informalities and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 3, 29, and 30 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 12-27, 31-37, and 39-51 remain pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

## **REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 21-27, 29, 45-46, 49, and 51 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Chowdhury et al, U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0022212, ('Chowdhury' hereinafter).

With respect to claim 21, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that Chowdhury fails to disclose or suggest "receiving by the AAA server a disconnect non-acknowledgement message from the first PDSN indicating that the first PDSN is unable to disconnect the user and release the resources associated with the session."

With respect to claim 45, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that Chowdhury fails to disclose or suggest "wherein the first PDSN sends a disconnect acknowledgement message to the AAA server indicating that the first PDSN has successfully disconnected the user when the first PDSN has released the resources."

With respect to claim 46, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that Chowdhury fails to disclose or suggest "wherein the first PDSN sends a disconnect non-acknowledgement message to the AAA server when the first PDSN is unable to disconnect the user and release the resources associated with the session when the first PDSN" or "wherein the first PDSN sends a disconnect acknowledgement message when the first PDSN releases the resources associated with the session in response to receiving the disconnect request message, wherein the resources are released prior to expiration of a PPP session timer."

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Chowdhury fails to anticipate claims 21-27, 29, 45-46, 49, and 51.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 10, 15-16, 42-44, and 50 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Borella, U.S. Patent No. 7,347,684, ('Borella' hereinafter) in view of Chowdhury.

With respect to claims 1 and 42-44, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that Borella and Chowdhury, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "wherein the disconnect request message is received by the PDSN from a second AAA server via the first AAA server, wherein the first AAA server is a visited AAA server associated with a foreign network." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 5, 10, 15-16, 42-44, and 50 are patentable over the cited references.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 7-9, 12-14, and 17 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Borella, U.S. Patent No. 7,347,684, ('Borella' hereinafter) in view of Chowdhury further in view of Raman et al, U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0018829, ('Raman' hereinafter).

With respect to claim 3 the Examiner cites paragraphs [0266] and [0270] of Raman. However, paragraph [0266] merely discloses that the HAAA sends a halt indication to the PDSN. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Raman teaches away from "wherein the disconnect request message is received by the PDSN from a second AAA server via the first AAA server, wherein the first AAA server is a visited AAA server associated with a foreign network." While paragraph [0270] discloses that the BAAA may act as a proxy to the HAAA, this is within the context of performing a hand-off of a wireless prepaid call. Thus, Raman fails to disclose or suggest the BAAA acting as a proxy for the purposes of sending a halt indication to the PDSN. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that

Raman fails to cure the deficiencies of Borella and Chowdhury. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims claim 1, as amended, 7-9, 12-14, and 17 are patentable over the cited references.

The Examiner rejected claims 18-19 and 20 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Borella, U.S. Patent No. 7,347,684, ('Borella' hereinafter) in view of Chowdhury further in view of Moller et al, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028598, ('Moller' hereinafter).

Applicant respectfully asserts that Moller fails to cure the deficiencies of Borella and Chowdhury. More particularly, the cited references, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "wherein the disconnect request message is received by the PDSN from a second AAA server via the first AAA server, wherein the first AAA server is a visited AAA server associated with a foreign network." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 18-19 and 20 are patentable over the cited references.

The Examiner rejected claim 31-41 and 47-48 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Chowdhury in view of Raman.

With respect to claims 31 and 47-48, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that Raman fails to disclose or suggest "wherein the AAA server is a visited AAA server associated with a foreign network," where the AAA server sends a disconnect request message to the PDSN. In fact, paragraph [0266] of Raman clearly discloses that the HAAA sends a halt indication to the PDSN. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Raman teaches away from "wherein the disconnect request message is received by the PDSN from a second AAA server via the first AAA server, wherein the first AAA server is a visited AAA

server associated with a foreign network.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 31-41 and 47-48 are patentable over the cited references.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are patentable over the cited art. The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed, as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a).

## **SUMMARY**

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. CISC326).

Respectfully submitted,  
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Elise R. Heilbrunn/  
Elise R. Heilbrunn  
Reg. No. 42,649

WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP  
P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
Tel: (510) 663-1100